

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims have been added, amended or canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-43 remain pending in this application.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-41, and 43 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dodrill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,901,431).

In the Response to Arguments on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated the following:

The applicants argue that Dodrill fails to disclose or suggest invoking a user interface developer component for creating a user interface during the execution of the software application within the software application. Dodrill does in fact teach [that] a user does request from the software, for instance accessing a new mail or voice mail as well as a dynamic request to update or personalize the XML data. See also Column 8 lines 62 – Column 9 lines 13.

The ability to access new mail or voice mail, as well as to update or personalize XML data is expressly disclosed by Dodrill. In particular, Dodrill discloses:

A user of the browser 56 typically sends a request to the application server 66 (via the web server 64) for a voice application operation 82, for example using an interface executable by a browser 56 or 62, for accessing new voice mail messages, new facsimile messages, new e-mail messages, and the like. A user of the browser 56 also can send a request to the application server 66 for creating or modifying an XML document defining a voice application operation, via a development tool common gateway interface (CGI).

\* Column 9, lines 25-34

This disclosure makes clear that a user through browser 56 can send a request to application server 66 for a voice application operation 82, such as accessing a new voice mail or e-mail message. Alternatively, a user can send a request to application server 66 to create or modify an XML document defining a voice application operation via a development tool CGI.

However, the request for a voice application operation 82 versus a request to create or modify an XML with the development tool CGI are made to two different applications. In particular, Dodrill discloses:

**In particular, the web browser 56 posts a user input for an application operation (i.e., an HTTP request) to a first URL for the voice application operation. In contrast, the web browser 56 posts to another URL for accessing the development tool CGI. Accessing the application server via the CGI enables the application server 66 to access a selected XML document, for example the XML document 100 illustrated in FIG. 3, in order to dynamically generate a form 102, illustrated in FIG. 4, that specifies selected application parameters of the XML document 100. Hence, accessing the application server by posting the user input according to a first URL causes execution of the XML document 100, whereas accessing the application server via the CGI causes the application server 66 to generate a form that specifies the contents of the XML document 100.**

\* Column 9, lines 34-48 (emphasis added)

In this disclosure, Dodrill indicates that request for an application operation are made through the browser 56 to a first URL (i.e., a first website), whereas requests for accessing the development tool CGI are made through the browser 56 to a different URL (i.e., a second website). Since requesting an application operation (e.g., accessing a voice mail) is made at a completely different website than accessing the development tool CGI (e.g., creating/modifying an XML document), the accessing of the development tool CGI to create or modify an XML document is necessarily part of a different software application than the application (e.g., voice application) in which that XML document is executed.

Thus, in contrast to claim 1, Dodrill fails to disclose or suggest invoking a user interface developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the software application from within the software application, and generating the user interface when its associated function is triggered based on the user interface definition file during the

execution of the software application. Rather, as discussed above, the software application for generating XML documents is completely separate from and accessed at a different website than the software application that executes an application operation based on that XML document.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Dodrill. Claims 2-5 and 7-8 are also patentably distinguishable from Dodrill by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as their additional recitations. Claims 9-13, 15-21, 23-29, 31-37, 39-41, and 43 are patentably distinguishable from Dodrill for reasons analogous to claim 1.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

**1. Claim 6 (Dodrill)**

On page 6 of the Office Action, claim 42 was rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dodrill. Claim 42 is patentably distinguishable from Dodrill by virtue of its dependence from claim 1, as well as its additional recitations.

**2. Claims 6, 14, 22, 30, and 38 (Dodrill and Lewallen)**

Lastly, on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 6, 14, 22, 30, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dodrill in view of Lewallen (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,224). As discussed in the Amendment filed on January 31, 2006, like Dodrill, Lewallen fails to disclose or suggest invoking a user interface developer component for creating the user interface during the execution of the software application from within the software application, and generating the user interface when its associated function is triggered based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, even if combinable, claim 6 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dodrill and Lewallen by virtue of its dependence from claim 1. Claims 14, 22, 30, and 38 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Dodrill and Lewallen for reasons analogous to claim 1.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2007

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis  
Registration No. 26,874

Marc K. Weinstein  
Registration No. 43,250

**Customer Number: 22428**

Attorneys for Applicants